

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-14, 16 and 18-20 are currently pending in the application. Applicants have canceled claims 2, 15 and 17, and amended claims 1, 3-4, 12, 14, 16 and 18. Applicants request reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 12 stands rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112. In accordance with this rejection, claim 12 has been amended to comply with the Examiner's suggestions and are now believed to conform to Section 112. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1, 5-7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Russell (U.S. Patent No. 5,423,621, hereinafter "Russell").

Claims 1, 5, 8-11, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sterrick (U.S. Patent No. 1,018,939, hereinafter "Sterrick").

Independent claim 1 was amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 2 that was indicated as allowable to obtain immediate allowance of the allowable subject matter. Independent claim 14 was amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 15 to obtain immediate allowance of the allowable subject matter. Dependent claim 17 was canceled and its subject matter moved to new independent claim 18. The rejection of dependent claim 17 is, therefore, obviated. Dependent claims 5-11, 13, 19 and 20 are

allowable for depending form independent claims 1 and 14 that now contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejections of claims 1, 5-11, 13, 14, 19 and 20 be withdrawn.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 2-4, 12, 15, 16 and 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and rejected claim 12 for indefiniteness, but indicated these claims would be allowable if claim 12 was corrected and all the claims were rewritten in independent form. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Claim 1 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 2, claim 14 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 15. Claims 12 and 18 were amended to include all of the subject matter of the claims from which they depend to place them in independent form. Therefore, each of remaining claims in the application is allowable.

Regarding Doctrine of Equivalents

Applicants hereby declare that any amendments herein that are not specifically made for the purpose of patentability are made for other purposes, such as clarification, and that no such changes shall be construed as limiting the scope of the claims or the application of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If any fees, including extension of time fees or additional claims fees, are due as a result of this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-3545. This authorization is intended to act as a constructive petition for an extension of time, should an extension of time be needed as a result of this response. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/19/07

By: /Kenneth C. Booth/ signed _____

Kenneth C. Booth

Reg. No. 42,342

BOOTH UDALL, PLC

1155 W. Rio Salado Parkway, Ste. 101

Tempe, AZ 85281

480.830.2700

480.830.2717 fax

kbooth@BoothUdall.com